

Serial No. 09/501,168

Remarks

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-16 stand allowed

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,418,130 issued to Cheng et al. on July 9, 2002.

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. in view of United States Patent No. 5,241,598 issued to Raith on August 31, 1993.

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the specification, drawing, and/or claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 CFR § 1.116 since the amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) does not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) satisfies a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) does not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; or (e) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better in conformance with the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in

Serial No. 09/501,168

the most minimal way, i.e., to just avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,418,130 issued to Cheng et al. on July 9, 2002.

Applicants continue to believe that the Office Action does not fully appreciate the term "knows" as used in claims 21 and 22, which requires that the first base station has the second base station listed in its "map" information, such a listing having been the result of a previous handoff of a wireless terminal between the first and second base stations.

By contrast, in Cheng et al., there is no teaching or suggestion that the administrative domains are other than conventional substantially static groupings in which each stationary unit knows each other stationary unit in the administrative domain a priori, and all are informed substantially at the same time if there are any changes. This is quite different from applicants' discovery concept of "knows"

Nevertheless, to further expedite prosecution, applicants have amended claim 21 to recite that the expedited handoff is performed using previously unused security information. At best, Cheng et al. teaches reusing previously used security information. Such previously used security information does not teach, nor does it suggest, applicants' previously unused security information, as the entire advantage taught by Cheng et al. emanates from the fact that the previously used information has already been processed and is trusted in a certain way.

Thus, applicants' invention as recited in claims 21-22, is allowable over Cheng et al.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. in view of United States Patent No. 5,241,598 issued to Raith on August 31, 1993.

As indicated in applicants' previous Amendment, neither Cheng et al. nor Raith teach or suggest the concept of a first base station knowing a second base station, as

Serial No. 09/501,168

"knowing" is defined in applicants' specification, and therefore being unable to perform expedited handoff when the second base station is not known.

Furthermore, the Office Action acknowledges that Cheng does not explicitly disclose that when the second base station does not know the first base station prior to receiving the request for handoff that the wireless terminal receives an indication that it must connect to the second base station without benefit of information supplied from the first base station to the second base station. To supply this limitation, the Office Action looks to Raith, stating that Raith teaches that a base station may inform a mobile station to disable encryption for a particular call. The Office Action thus concludes from this ability that the mobile terminal is thereby informed that it will handoff without the benefit of information supplied from a first base station.

Even if the Office Action's statement regarding the actual teaching of Raith is correct, its inference therefrom is erroneous. In Raith, there is no suggestion that, had encryption been enabled, information for use in performing a handoff would be transferred from the first base station to the second base station. Thus, notwithstanding the Office Action's suggestion to the contrary, communicating that encryption should be disabled cannot be interpreted as a message indicating that information for use in performing a handoff will not be transferred from the first base station to the second base station.

Furthermore, the encryption that the Office Action mentions as being disabled is the encryption of the user traffic, e.g., the contents of the voice or data being communicated between the user and the ultimate other end of the call. This is different from information relating to handoffs, which is the subject of claims 17-20.

Consequently, there is no suggestion in Raith of an indication received by the wireless terminal that it must connect to the second base station without benefit of information supplied from the first base station.

Therefore, Neither Cheng et al. nor Raith, alone or in combination, can make obvious applicants' claims 17-20, which are, therefore, allowable 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Serial No. 09/501,168

Conclusion


It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, he is invited to call applicant's attorney so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

In the event that an extension of time is required for this amendment to be considered timely, and a petition therefor does not otherwise accompany this amendment, any necessary extension of time is hereby petitioned for, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the appropriate cost of such petition to the **Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No. 12-2325**.

Respectfully,

S. Davies
M. Vanderveen

By 
Eugene J. Rosenthal, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,658
732-949-1857

Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: 11/1/04